

POLSINELLI LLP

Garrick Vanderfin (State Bar No. 316159)
gvanderfin@polsinelli.com
2049 Century Park East, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 556-1801
Facsimile: (310) 556-1802

Attorney for Secured Creditor Korth Direct Mortgage, Inc.

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES DIVISION**

In re

SEATON INVESTMENTS, LLC, *et al.*,

Debtors and Debtors-in-Possession.

Affects:

- ☐ All Debtors
☒ Seaton Investments, LLC
☐ Colyton Investments, LLC
☐ Broadway Avenue Investments, LLC
☐ SLA Investments, LLC
☐ Negev Investments, LLC
☐ Alan Gomperts
☐ Daniel Halevy
☐ Susan Halevy

Lead Case No. 2:24-bk-12079-VZ

Jointly Administered with Case Nos.:

2:24-bk-12080-VZ; 2:24-bk-12081-VZ;
2:24-bk-12082-VZ; 2:24-bk-12091-VZ;
2:24-bk-12074-VZ; 2:24-bk-12075-VZ; and
2:24-bk-12076-VZ

Chapter 11

**KORTH DIRECT MORTGAGE'S
OBJECTION TO DEBTOR SEATON
INVESTMENTS, LLC'S MOTION TO
ENTER POST-PETITION LEASE AND
MOTION TO ENTER POST-PETITION
FINANCING**

Date: December 12, 2024
Time: 11:00 a.m.
Crtrm.: 1368, Roybal Federal Building
255 E Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Hon. Vincent P. Zurzolo

1 Secured creditor, Korth Direct Mortgage, Inc. (“**Korth**”), submits this objection (the
2 “**Objection**”) in response to the above-captioned debtor and debtor-in-possession’s (the “**Debtor**”
3 or “**Seaton**”) *Motion of Debtor and Debtor in Possession Seaton Investments, LLC for Order*
4 *Authorizing Debtor to Enter into Post-Petition Lease* (the “**Lease Motion**”) [ECF No. 314] and
5 *Motion of Debtor and Debtor in Possession Seaton Investments, LLC for Order Authorizing Debtor*
6 *to Obtain Post-Petition Financing Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 364* (the “**DIP Motion**”) [ECF No. 312].
7 In support of its Objection, Korth respectfully states as follows:
8

9 **BACKGROUND**

10 1. On or about April 23, 2021, a predecessor in interest to Korth entered into loan
11 transactions (the “**Loans**”) with debtors Colyton Investments, LLC (“**Colyton**”), and Seaton, which
12 were secured by certain real property owned by Colyton at 421 Colyton Street, Los Angeles, CA
13 90013 (the “**Colyton Property**”) and by Seaton at 440 Seaton Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90013 (the
14 “**Seaton Property**”) and operated as a single economic unit. A detailed background of the Loans
15 can be found in Korth’s proof of claim filed as Claim No. 2 in Case No. 24-12080.

16 2. In addition to the transactions with Colyton and Seaton, Korth was granted
17 guarantees of the Colyton and Seaton Loans by individual debtors Alan Gomperts, Daniel Halevy,
18 and Susan Halevy.¹

19 3. Seaton and its affiliates filed for bankruptcy on March 19, 2024, roughly a month
20 before the balloon payment on the Colyton and Seaton Loans were due. The debtors moved for
21 joint administration (the “**Jointly Administered Debtors**”) and the motion was granted.

22 4. On November 22, 2024, Seaton filed the Lease Motion and the DIP Motion, seeking
23 to enter into a fifteen (15) year lease (the “**Lease**”) with Levav Group LLC (“**Levav**”) and DMB
24 Fund, a California non-profit d/b/a Broadway Community Care Centers (“**DMB**,” together with
25 Levav, the “**Tenants**”) and a four (4) million-dollar DIP loan (the “**DIP Loan**”) with New Millenia
26 Group.

27
28 ¹ The original Guaranty was executed by David Halevy, who is now deceased. According to the
Debtors, the obligation is now owned by Susan Halevy via the Halevy Trust.

1 5. Per the Lease, the Tenants plan to operate a facility for “‘Behavioral Health
2 Treatment’ of adolescents and adults including without limitation, unhoused people, Skidrow
3 population, veterans and all those in need of mental and behavioral services for both outpatient and
4 inpatient services.” Lease, § 4.05.

5 6. Neither the Lease nor the Lease Motion discuss whether such a facility would be
6 allowed in the Seaton Property based on the current zoning of the Seaton Property, and neither the
7 Lease nor the Lease Motion address any contingencies for seeking any variances.² The Lease
8 purports to require the Tenants to secure all permits necessary, but the Motion does not address the
9 status of those permits nor any plan to obtain the permits.

10 7. In support of the Lease and Lease Motion, Seaton filed the *Declaration of Ari Stock*
11 *in Support of Motion of Debtor to Enter into Post-Petition Lease* (the “**Stock Declaration**”) [ECF
12 314-2]. The Stock Declaration alleges that Levav “is in the healthcare business providing support
13 for mental healthcare facilities” and that “Levav’s commitment as a tenant is not contingent upon
14 the application of grants, subsidies, and other government and NGO incentives that may be applied
15 for in connection with the provision of medical and social services at the property.” Stock Decl., p.
16 1.

17 8. In further support of the Lease Motion, the Stock Declaration attaches “Levav’s
18 financial statements” that purport to show its financial health. However, the financial statements
19 raise numerous issues.

20 9. First, the financial statements are for entities named “Bellflower Post Acute,” “El
21 Rancho Vista Healthcare Center,” and “Long Beach Post Acute.” It is entirely unclear how or even
22 whether these entities are related to Levav, or whether they are separate entities altogether. All
23 three facilities, by their names and a quick google search, appear to be skilled nursing,
24 rehabilitation, and other short-term senior care facilities. A significant difference from a behavioral
25 health treatment facility.

26
27 ² For example, one potential issue left unaddressed by the Lease Motion and the Lease is the
28 current zoning on the facility. The property is currently zoned M3-1-RIO. As currently regulated,
 M3 zoned areas cannot contain “Hospitals or sanitariums.”

1 10. Second, the financial statements show that all three facilities are entirely dependent
2 on “the application of grants, subsidies, and other government and NGO incentives” for their
3 operation. For example, Bellflower’s profit and loss statement shows that over 90% of its operating
4 income attributable to its skilled nursing facility comes from either Medicare or Medicaid. Similar
5 percentages exist at the El Rancho Vista and Long Beach Post Acute facilities.

6 11. Seaton ostensibly plans to use the proceeds of the DIP Loan to fund four million
7 dollars of improvements to the Seaton property—defined as “Lessor’s Work”—as required under
8 the Lease. Under the terms of the Lease, the Tenants are then to reimburse Seaton through sums
9 received from any “Governmental Agency” that would reimburse the improvements made to the
10 Seaton Property.

11 12. The DIP Loan’s substantive economic terms include a 6% origination fee
12 (\$240,000), a diligence fee of \$10,000, a twelve-month term, and an interest rate of 12%. During
13 the term, interest-only payments are required, with a balloon payment occurring at the end of the
14 twelve months.

15 13. The DIP Loan is secured by “grants, subsidies, and other government and NGO
16 incentives paid to Seaton” and “personal property acquired with proceeds of the Loan,” which
17 seems to also be the source of the rent paid under the Lease and presumably the income stream
18 from which Korth will be paid.

19 14. Seaton and the Jointly Administered Debtors do not provide any information as to
20 where the payment for the origination fee and the diligence fee is coming from.

21 15. Previously, the Jointly Administered Debtors sought to enter into a similar lease and
22 operation arrangement with another property in these Chapter 11 Cases, referred to as the Broadway
23 Property, with the same Tenants. *See* ECF No. 248.

24 16. The secured lender on the Broadway Property, Archway, objected to the lease
25 arrangement on the Broadway Property, calling into question the legitimacy and credibility of the
26
27
28

principals behind Levav and DMB.³ See ECF No. 279. As a result, the Jointly Administered Debtors withdrew the motion on the Broadway property, and refiled—removing all mention to the principals that Archway took issue with. See ECF No. 330.

OBJECTION

17. Korth files this Objection to the Debtor’s Motion to enter into the Lease and the DIP Loan because (i) Seaton and the Jointly Administered Debtors have not met their burden showing that entering into the Lease is a sound exercise of its business judgment; (ii) entering into the Lease is in direct conflict with its fiduciary duty to its creditors—namely Korth; and (iii) because the success of Seaton’s Plan is clearly contingent upon entering into the Lease, the proper time to determine whether entering into the Lease is proper is at Plan confirmation, and not at this juncture.

I. Entering into the Lease is not a sound exercise of Seaton and the Jointly Administered Debtors’ business judgment because optimal value would not be realized.

18. Seaton seeks to enter into the Lease pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1). See Lease Mot., 7. As such, Seaton must show that executing the Lease is an exercise of its sound business judgment. See, e.g., *In re Baroni*, 654 B.R. 334, 342 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2023). As Seaton recognizes, the business judgment rule is merely a “presumption that in making a business decision the directors of a corporation acted on an informed basis, in good faith and in the honest belief that the action was in the best interests of the company.” Lease Mot., 7. The business judgment rule does not, however, provide blanket authority to a debtor to enter into any transaction nor is it a rubber stamp on the decision-making of officers or directors.

19. Moreover, courts in the Ninth Circuit have an “obligation” when Bankruptcy Code section 363 is invoked “to assure that optimal value is realized by the estate under the circumstances.” *In re Lahijani*, 325 B.R. 282, 288–89 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005). Here, Seaton has not made any showing of its sound business judgment nor that invoking section 363 would lead to “optimal value” realized by the estate.

³ Korth has not been able to independently verify or address the allegations in Archway’s Lease Objection, given that Seaton’s Lease Motion was filed on November 22, 2024. To the extent of the veracity of Archway’s allegations, Korth would certainly object on those bases as well.

20. Seaton merely states in the Lease Motion that “[e]ntering into the Lease is an exercise of Seaton’s business judgment.” Seaton does not, however, explain how entering into the lease maximizes the value of the state or furthers its plan of reorganization. Seaton also does not provide any evidence as to how it exercised its discretion of its business judgment, but rather relies on short declarations by the Tenants.

21. While Seaton does state that the “Lease and the DIP Loan will allow Seaton to propose a plan to pay its creditors,” the economic reality of the nature of the Lease, its current debt structure, and the real estate market does not support the assertion that the Lease will help implement a confirmable Plan.

22. Seaton’s current plan is to make payments to Korth over three (3) years and then make a balloon payment that would pay Korth’s secured claim in full at the conclusion of the plan payments. *See* ECF No. 276, at § V.E. To make this payment, Seaton would need to either refinance the Seaton Property or sell the Seaton Property and use the proceeds to pay off Korth.

23. Placing such special-use Tenants—behavioral health services for a transient population—in the Seaton Property potentially undermines the value of the Seaton Property and makes it impossible to sell or refinance at a price that can support pay-off under the Plan. No evidence has been provided through the Lease Motion or the DIP Motion that entering into the Lease and the DIP Loan will support a valuation at a price that can validly support Plan payments for Korth’s claim in a cram-down Plan.

24. Seaton has clearly not shown this Court through the Lease Motion or the DIP Motion that “optimal value” would be realized by the estate under the terms of the Lease.

25. In addition, the very financial statements Levav provided show that it is not in the business of providing either the type of services contemplated under the Lease or serving the type population contemplated under the Lease. More damaging, Seaton has not offered any evidence connecting Bellflower Post Acute, El Rancho Vista Healthcare Center, or Long Beach Post Acute to Levav or DMB.

26. Levav’s financial statements purport to show it in the business of staffing or running senior care rehabilitation centers that are funded almost entirely through Medicare and Medicaid.

1 This is a far cry from behavioral health centers for a population that may not qualify for Medicare
2 and Medicaid. Further, Levav’s own financials call into question the statement in the Stock
3 Declaration that Levav is prepared to be a tenant regardless of whether they receive grants,
4 government subsidies, or other NGO support as 90% of its revenue at the facilities for which it
5 provided financials receive significant money from government programs. It is difficult to
6 imagine—and Seaton has provided no evidence of—the Tenants having the capital to make the
7 Lease payments without grants, government subsidies, or other NGO support. The ability of the
8 Tenants to perform under the Lease is entirely speculative.

9 27. Lastly, the Jointly Administered Debtors are in the process of having a luxury spa
10 tenant build out and take possession of the Colyton Property. The Jointly Administered Debtors
11 have repeatedly referred to the Seaton and Colyton Property as being operated as a “single
12 economic unit.” Nowhere in the Lease Motion or the DIP Motion does Seaton or the Jointly
13 Administered Debtors attempt to reconcile putting a treatment facility for a transient population in
14 the same facility as a luxury spa tenant. These uses seem entirely incompatible.

15 **II. Entry into the Lease is a conflict with Seaton’s fiduciary duty to maximize the**
16 **estate for its creditors.**

17 28. A “debtor in possession performing the duties of the trustee is the representative of
18 the estate and is saddled with the same fiduciary duty to maximize the value of the estate available
19 to creditors.” *Cheng v. K&S Diversified Invs., Inc. (In re Cheng)*, 308 B.R. 448, 455 (B.A.P. 9th
20 Cir. 2004).

21 29. Here, the estate of Seaton consists of one asset: the Seaton Property (and potential
22 rents derived therefrom). The primary creditor on the Seaton Property is Korth. Now that Seaton is
23 insolvent and in bankruptcy, it has a fiduciary duty to maximize the value of the Seaton Property
24 for Korth’s benefit. *See In re Reliant Energy Channelview LP*, 594 F.2d 200, 210 (3d Cir. 2010).
25 If entering into the Lease would further devalue the property, then Seaton is in violation of its
26 fiduciary duty to the estate and Korth.

27 30. As mentioned, Korth has concerns that entering the Lease is (1) not allowed under
28 current zoning; (2) could cause the property to become valued as a “special use property”; and (3)

1 would devalue the property such that a refinancing or sale of the property would be impossible in
2 an amount that would properly lead to the balloon payment for Korth's claim as contemplated under
3 the Plan.

4 31. To address this issue with valuation of the Seaton Property, and whether the Lease
5 properly maximizes the value of the estate—thus meeting Seaton's fiduciary duty—Korth plans to
6 issue discovery under Bankruptcy Rule 9014(c). Until such time, however, it is premature for this
7 Court to determine whether to authorize Seaton to enter into the Lease.

8 **III. The Lease is the cornerstone of Seaton's Plan, and any determination of the Lease**
9 **should be considered with the Plan.**

10 32. Korth plans on objecting to the Jointly Administered Debtor's Plan. The objection
11 deadline for the Plan is not scheduled until February 13, 2025.

12 33. As Seaton asserts in the Lease Motion, the Lease means that "Seaton's ability to
13 confirm a plan will be assured." Lease Mot., 6. Korth disagrees.

14 34. Korth does agree with Seaton, however, that without the Lease the Plan cannot be
15 confirmed. Moreover, as Seaton alludes to, the Lease is the fulcrum point for the Plan. That is, the
16 Plan would have a possibility of success only if the Lease is entered into (although Korth does not
17 believe this is the case either).

18 35. Because the success of the Plan is so dependent on the Lease—and whether the
19 Lease can provide a valuation for the satisfaction of Korth's claim as required under the Bankruptcy
20 Code—this Court should not approve the Lease, if at all, until Plan confirmation.

21 36. Given the imminent discovery Korth will issue relating to valuation, the Lease, and
22 the proposed Tenants, it is simply too premature to rule on an issue that could determine the *entire*
23 case.

24 **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

25 Korth reserves all rights to later object to the Plan, and nothing herein should be considered
26 a waiver of any right Korth may have under applicable bankruptcy or non-bankruptcy law, or any
27 equitable relief as it may be entitled to.

Dated: November 29, 2024

POLSINELLI LLP

By: /s/ Garrick Vanderfin
Garrick Vanderfin

Attorney for Korth Direct Mortgage, Inc.

PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is:
2049 Century Park East, Suite 2900, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

A true and correct copy of the foregoing document entitled (*specify*): **KORTH DIRECT MORTGAGE'S OBJECTION TO DEBTOR SEATON INVESTMENTS, LLC'S MOTION TO ENTER POST-PETITION LEASE AND MOTION TO ENTER POST-PETITION FINANCING** will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner stated below:

1. TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF): Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBR, the foregoing document will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On November 29, 2024, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following persons are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below:

☒ Service information continued on attached page

2. SERVED BY UNITED STATES MAIL:

On November 29, 2024, I served the following persons and/or entities at the last known addresses in this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that mailing to the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

☐ Service information continued on attached page

3. SERVED BY PERSONAL DELIVERY, OVERNIGHT MAIL, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL (state method for each person or entity served): Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/or controlling LBR, on November 29, 2024, I served the following persons and/or entities by personal delivery, overnight mail service, or (for those who consented in writing to such service method), by facsimile transmission and/or email as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that personal delivery on, or overnight mail to, the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Honorable Vincent P. Zurzolo
United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Edward R. Roybal Federal Building and Courthouse
255 E. Temple Street, Suite 1360 / Courtroom 1368
Los Angeles, CA 90012

☐ Service information continued on attached page

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

November 29, 2024 Garrick Vanderfin
Date *Printed Name*

/s/ Garrick Vanderfin
Signature

ATTACHMENT TO SERVICE LIST

1. TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF)

Scott R Albrecht on behalf of Creditor First Foundation Bank
salbrecht@gsaattorneys.com, jackie.nguyen@sgsattorneys.com

Tanya Behnam on behalf of Creditor Korth Direct Mortgage Inc.
tbehnam@polsinelli.com, tanyabehnam@gmail.com; ccripe@polsinelli.com; ladocketing@polsinelli.com

Jacquelyn H Choi on behalf of Creditor LOS ANGELES COUNTY TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR
jacquelyn.choi@rimonlaw.com, docketingsupport@rimonlaw.com

Carol Chow on behalf of Debtor Alan Gomperts
Carol.Chow@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com, easter.santamaria@saul.com

Carol Chow on behalf of Debtor Daniel Halevy
Carol.Chow@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com, easter.santamaria@saul.com

Carol Chow on behalf of Debtor Susan Halevy
Carol.Chow@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com, easter.santamaria@saul.com

Robert F Conte on behalf of Creditor United States of America on behalf of Internal Revenue Service
robert.conte@usdoj.gov, caseview.ecf@usdoj.gov; usacac.tax@usdoj.gov

Ryan Coy on behalf of Defendant Daniel Halevy
ryan.coy@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com; Shelly.Guise@saul.com; LitigationDocketing@saul.com

Ryan Coy on behalf of Defendant Susan Halevy
ryan.coy@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com; Shelly.Guise@saul.com; LitigationDocketing@saul.com

Ryan Coy on behalf of Interested Party Courtesy NEF
ryan.coy@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com; Shelly.Guise@saul.com; LitigationDocketing@saul.com

Ryan Coy on behalf of Interested Party Alan Gomperts
ryan.coy@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com; Shelly.Guise@saul.com; LitigationDocketing@saul.com

Ryan Coy on behalf of Interested Party Daniel Halevy
ryan.coy@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com; Shelly.Guise@saul.com; LitigationDocketing@saul.com

Ryan Coy on behalf of Interested Party Susan Halevy
ryan.coy@saul.com, hannah.richmond@saul.com; Shelly.Guise@saul.com; LitigationDocketing@saul.com

Christopher Cramer on behalf of Interested Party Courtesy NEF
secured@becket-lee.com

Turner Falk on behalf of Debtor Alan Gomperts
turner.falk@saul.com, tnfalk@recap.email

Turner Falk on behalf of Debtor Daniel Halevy
turner.falk@saul.com, tnfalk@recap.email

Turner Falk on behalf of Debtor Susan Halevy
turner.falk@saul.com, tnfalk@recap.email

Turner Falk on behalf of Interested Party Daniel Halevy
turner.falk@saull.com, tnfalk@recap.email

Turner Falk on behalf of Interested Party Susan Halevy
turner.falk@saull.com, tnfalk@recap.email

Michael G Fletcher on behalf of Creditor Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC, fka Archway Real Estate Income Fund I REIT, LLC
mfletcher@frandzel.com, sking@frandzel.com

Michael G Fletcher on behalf of Creditor Archway Real Estate Income Fund I SPE I, LLC
mfletcher@frandzel.com, sking@frandzel.com

Michael G Fletcher on behalf of Creditor Archway real estate income fund
mfletcher@frandzel.com, sking@frandzel.com

Michael G Fletcher on behalf of Plaintiff Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company
mfletcher@frandzel.com, sking@frandzel.com

Todd S. Garan on behalf of Creditor Wells Fargo National Bank West
ch11ecf@aldridgepite.com, TSG@ecf.inforuptcy.com; tgaran@aldridgepite.com

Todd S. Garan on behalf of Interested Party Courtesy NEF
ch11ecf@aldridgepite.com, TSG@ecf.inforuptcy.com; tgaran@aldridgepite.com

Richard Girgado on behalf of Creditor LOS ANGELES COUNTY TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR
rgirgado@counsel.lacounty.gov

Jacqueline L James on behalf of Creditor Harvest Small Business Finance, LLC
jjames@hrhlaw.com

Jacqueline L James on behalf of Interested Party Harvest Small Business Finance, LLC
jjames@hrhlaw.com

Kelly L Morrison on behalf of U.S. Trustee United States Trustee (LA)
kelly.l.morrison@usdoj.gov

Avi Edward Muhtar on behalf of Interested Party Avi Muhtar
amuhtar@crowndandstonelaw.com

Bruce D Poltrock on behalf of Creditor Archway Real Estate Income Fund I SPE I, LLC
bpoltrock@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Paige Selina Poupart on behalf of Creditor Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC, fka Archway Real Estate Income Fund I REIT, LLC
ppoupart@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Paige Selina Poupart on behalf of Creditor Archway Real Estate Income Fund I SPE I, LLC
ppoupart@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Paige Selina Poupart on behalf of Plaintiff Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company

ppoupart@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Debtor Alan Gomperts

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Debtor Daniel Halevy

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Debtor Susan Halevy

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Interested Party Courtesy NEF

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Interested Party Alan Gomperts

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Interested Party Daniel Halevy

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Zev Shechtman on behalf of Interested Party Susan Halevy

Zev.Shechtman@saul.com, zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com; hannah.richmond@saul.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Debtor Broadway Avenue Investments, LLC

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Debtor Colyton Investments, LLC

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Debtor Negev Investments, LLC

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Debtor SLA Investments, LLC

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Debtor Seaton Investments, LLC

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Interested Party Daniel Halevy

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

Derrick Talerico on behalf of Interested Party Susan Halevy

dtalerico@wztslaw.com, maraki@wztslaw.com, sfritz@wztslaw.com, admin@wztslaw.com

United States Trustee (LA)

ustpreion16.la.ecf@usdoj.gov

Gerrick Warrington on behalf of Creditor Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC

gwarrington@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Gerrick Warrington on behalf of Creditor Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC, fka Archway Real Estate Income Fund I REIT, LLC

gwarrington@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Gerrick Warrington on behalf of Creditor Archway Real Estate Income Fund I SPE I, LLC
gwarrington@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Gerrick Warrington on behalf of Creditor Archway real estate income fund
gwarrington@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Gerrick Warrington on behalf of Plaintiff Archway Broadway Loan SPE, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company
gwarrington@frandzel.com, achase@frandzel.com

Jennifer C Wong on behalf of Creditor Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
bknotice@mccarthyholthus.com, jwong@ecf.courtdrive.com

Jennifer C Wong on behalf of Interested Party Courtesy NEF
bknotice@mccarthyholthus.com, jwong@ecf.courtdrive.com